



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,651	01/27/2004	Ronald A. Beyerinck	PC23195B	4574
28523	7590	09/14/2007	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC.			SASAN, ARADHANA	
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 EASTERN POINT ROAD GROTON, CT 06340			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1615	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/766,651	BEYERINCK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aradhana Sasan	1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

 | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application

1. The remarks filed on 07/11/07 are acknowledged.
2. Claims 22-43 are included in the prosecution.

Response to Arguments

Rejection of claims 22-43 under nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

3. Applicant's filing of a terminal disclaimer with respect to the rejection of claims 22-43 as being unpatentable over claim 21 in view of claims 1, 7-16, 17-20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,607 is acknowledged. The nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of 4/23/07 is withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 22-43 under 35 USC § 103(a)

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 22-43 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curatolo et al. (US 2002/0103225) have been fully considered. Applicant states that because the Curatolo reference is a § 102(e) type reference, 35 U.S. C. § 103(c) applies. Applicant states that "at the time the present invention was made, the present application and the Curatolo reference were subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person" is insufficient. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are found persuasive. The rejection of claims 22-43 under 35 USC § 103(a) of 4/23/07 is withdrawn.

5. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Illum (WO 96/41632), Chang et al. (US 6,121,283), Nakamichi et al. (US 5,456,923), and Gombotz et al. (US 5,019,40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632).

The claimed invention is a composition comprising an amorphous dispersion of a drug and a polymer. The particles of the dispersion have an average diameter of at least 40 μm , a bulk specific volume of less than 5ml/g, and at least 80 vol% of the particles have a diameter greater than 10 μm .

Illum teaches a pharmaceutical composition comprising an anti migraine compound and starch microspheres (Abstract). A therapeutically effective amount of a compound is loaded on starch microspheres (Page 3, lines 10-13). "At least 80% (measured by weight) of the microspheres should have a diameter ranging between about 10 and 200 μm ... (and) more than 90% (measured by weight) of the microspheres should have a diameter between 10 and 200 μm " (Page 3, lines 32-36).

Illum does not expressly teach the bulk specific volume of less than 5ml/g.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a pharmaceutical composition comprising microspheres loaded with a drug, as suggested by Illum, and produce the instant invention of a composition comprising a plurality of dispersion particles of a drug and a polymer.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the reference teaches the limitations of instant claim 1, the particle size of the composition comprising a drug and a polymer. One skilled in the art would know that the composition is a delivery platform for a drug and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention.

Regarding instant claims 22 and 25, the limitation of the bulk specific volume of less than 5ml/g would have been obvious to one skilled in the art as a physical property of the particles. One skilled in the art would modify the components of the composition and measure the bulk specific volume of the particles during the process of routine experimentation as a physical indicator and the recited bulk specific volume would have been an obvious variant absent evidence of criticality or unexpected results.

Regarding instant claims 22-24, the limitation of the particle diameter would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over the particle size teaching of Illum.

8. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632) in view of Chang et al. (US 6,121,283).

The teaching of Illum is stated above.

Illum does not expressly teach the drug as cholesteryl ester transfer protein inhibitor.

Chang teaches pharmaceutical compositions suitable for the treatment of conditions including atherosclerosis, hypercholesterolemia, hyperglyceridemia, and hyperlipidemia (Col. 9, lines 10-13). The compounds of the invention may be used in

conjunction with other pharmaceutical agents, including other lipid lowering agents such as CETP inhibitors (Col. 9, lines 41-47). "Any compound having activity as a CETP inhibitor can serve as the second compound in the combination therapy ... The term CETP inhibitor refers to compounds which inhibit the cholesteryl ester transfer protein (CETP) mediated transport of various cholesteryl esters and triglycerides from high density lipoprotein (HDL) to low density lipoprotein (LDL) and very low density lipoprotein (VLDL)" (Col. 10, line 66 to Col. 11, line 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a pharmaceutical composition comprising microspheres loaded with a drug, as suggested by Illum, and combine it with the CETP inhibitor as the drug, as taught by Chang, and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Chang teaches dosage forms of the compounds (including CETP inhibitors) such as oral dosage forms, tablets, pills, and capsules (Col. 31, lines 5-34). One skilled in the art would use the drug in the microsphere composition taught by Illum and have a reasonable expectation of success.

9. Claims 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632) in view of Chang et al. (US 6,121,283), and further in view of Nakamichi et al. (US 5,456,923).

The teachings of Illum and Chang are stated above.

Illum and Chang do not expressly teach a cellulosic polymer in the composition.

Nakamichi teaches a solid dispersion produced without heating a drug and polymer to or beyond their melting points and without using an organic solvent for dissolving both components (Abstract). "The term 'solid dispersion' is used ... to mean an drug-containing pharmaceutical bulk substance comprising the drug dissolved or dispersed in a polymer" (Col. 1, lines 14-16). Hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate is disclosed as a polymer used in the solid dispersion (Col. 2, line 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a pharmaceutical composition comprising microspheres loaded with a drug, as suggested by Illum, and combine it with the CETP inhibitor as the drug, as taught by Chang, and further combine it with the hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate as the polymer in the dispersion, as taught by Nakamichi, and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Nakamichi teaches that "solid dispersions are of use for an enhanced solubility of drugs or for controlling the rate of release of a drug from a dosage form or improving the bioavailability of drugs, thus being of significant commercial value" (Col. 1, lines 19-22).

Regarding instant claims 28-31, the limitations of the cellulosic polymer, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose, and hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over the hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate teaching of Nakamichi.

Regarding instant claim 31, the limitations of the drug would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over the CETP inhibitor teaching of Chang.

Regarding instant claim 32, the “substantially homogenous” dispersion limitation would have been obvious because during the process of routine optimization, one skilled in the art would ensure the homogeneity of the dispersion prior to using the dispersion further, i.e. ensure that the drug was substantially homogenously dispersed in the polymer. The limitation of the “substantially amorphous” drug would have been obvious to one skilled in the art because a certain amount of crystalline drug would be allowed in a “substantially amorphous” drug.

Regarding instant claims 33-34, the concentration-enhancing polymer would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over the hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate teaching of Nakamichi. As shown in Test Example 1, the dispersion of the drug in the polymer (hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate) has the function of acting as an enteric coated product (Col. 9, lines 25-38). Therefore, the polymer allows the protection of the drug or concentration enhancement of the drug when administered in a particular use environment.

Regarding instant claims 35-37, the maximum drug concentration enhancement of at least 1.25 fold would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would modify the composition as taught by Illum, in view of Chang and Nakamichi, in order to optimize the desired drug delivery rate or concentration, area under the drug concentration versus time curve, and relative bioavailability of the drug in the target environment and compare it to a control composition during the process of routine experimentation.

10. Claims 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Illum (WO 96/41632) in view of Gombotz et al. (US 5,019,400).

The teaching of Illum is stated above.

Illum does not expressly teach the dispersion formed by a spray drying process.

Gombotz teaches: "a variety of techniques are known by which active agents can be incorporated into polymeric microspheres. An example is spray drying. In spray drying, the polymer and active agent are mixed together in a solvent for the polymer, then the solvent is evaporated by spraying the solution, leaving polymeric droplets containing the active agent" (Col. 1, lines 9-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a pharmaceutical composition comprising microspheres loaded with a drug, as suggested by Illum, and combine it with the spray drying technique for mixing drug into polymer microspheres, as disclosed by Gombotz, and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because the spray drying technique disclosed by Gombotz is an alternate process to making dispersions of drug and polymer and would be obvious to try with a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding instant claim 38, the composition made by the process of spray drying would have been obvious to one skilled in the art over the spray drying teaching of Gombotz.

Regarding instant claims 39, 40, and 41, the average droplet diameter, D_{10} and D_{90} limitations would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would measure the droplet diameter and determine the D_{10} and D_{90} during the process of routine optimization and the recited diameters would have been obvious variants absent any evidence of criticality or unexpected results.

Regarding instant claims 42 and 43, the span limitations would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would measure and optimize the particle diameter ranges and further calculate the span during the process of routine experimentation. The recited span values would have been obvious variants absent any evidence of criticality or unexpected results.

Conclusion

11. Due to the new grounds of rejection, this action is made non-final.
12. No claims are allowed.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aradhana Sasan whose telephone number is (571) 272-9022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached at 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



MICHAEL P. WOODWARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600